

HOLOMORPHIC EXTENSION FROM A CONVEX HYPERSURFACE

LUCA BARACCO

ABSTRACT. We discuss a general result of holomorphic extension of a real analytic function f defined on the boundary ∂D of a real analytic strictly convex subset $D \subset \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. We show that this follows from the hypothesis of separate holomorphic extension along stationary/extremal discs.

MSC: 32V10, 32N15, 32D10

1. STATIONARY DISCS AND HOLOMORPHIC EXTENSION

The problem of testing analyticity on a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ by a family of discs has attracted a great deal of work. The first significant result goes back to Stout [11] who uses as testing family all the straight lines. Reducing the testing family, Agranovsky and Semenov [2] use the lines which meet an open subset $D' \subset \subset D$. It is classical that the lines which meet a single point $z_o \in D$ do not suffice not even in the case of the sphere $\mathbb{B}^n$. Other testing families are considered among others, by [7],[10],[5]. In the present paper for a strictly convex C^ω domain D , we prove that the stationary discs passing through a point of $\bar{D}$ is a testing family if the point belongs to the boundary ∂D and, otherwise, if it is supplemented by another $(2n-2)$ -parameter, generic family. In particular this second can be chosen as the family of stationary discs through another point of D . This result is also present in a recent paper by Agranovsky [1]. We deal with stationary/extremal discs in the sense of Lempert [8]. We first introduce some terminology. A disc A is the holomorphic image of the standard disc Δ ; $\mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n$ is the cotangent bundle with projectivized fibers, and π the projection on the base point; $\mathbb{T}_{\partial D}^*\mathbb{C}^n$ the projectivized conormal bundle to ∂D in $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Definition 1.1. A disc A of D is said to be stationary when it is endowed with a meromorphic lift $A^* \subset \mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n$ with a simple pole attached to $T_{\partial D}^*\mathbb{C}^n$, that is, satisfying $\partial A^* \subset \mathbb{T}_{\partial D}^*\mathbb{C}^n$.

We fix a stationary disc A_o of D and, in the ϵ -neighborhood of A_o , consider a certain number of $(2n-2)$ -parameter families of stationary discs $\{\mathcal{V}_j\}_{j=1,\dots,k}$ smoothly depending on the parameters. We denote by $\mathcal{V}_j^*$ the family of lifts of the discs in $\mathcal{V}_j$ and define

$$(1.1) \quad M_j := \bigcup_{A^* \in \mathcal{V}_j^*} A^*.$$

The set M_j is generically a CR manifold with CR dimension 1 except at the points of a closed set; we denote by M_j^{reg} the complement of this set. We assume

$$(1.2) \quad A_o^* \subset \bigcup_j M_j^{\text{reg}}.$$

Here is our main result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $D \subset\subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a strictly convex domain with C^ω boundary and f a C^ω function on ∂D . Suppose that f extends holomorphically along each disc $A \in \bigcup_{j=1,\dots,k} \mathcal{V}_j$ and that the sets M_j which collect the discs of $\mathcal{V}_j$ satisfy (1.2). Then f extends holomorphically to D .*

The proof is given in next section. Theorem 1.2 states a general principle: $(2n-2)$ -families of stationary discs generically suffice. To exhibit explicit families the following criterion is very effective.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\mathcal{V}$ be the discs through a point $z_o \in \bar{D}$ and M the union of their lifts.*

(i) *If $z_o \in D$, then*

$$A_o^* \setminus \pi^{-1}(z_o) \subset M^{\text{reg}}.$$

(ii) *If $z_o \in \partial D$, then*

$$A_o^* \subset M^{\text{reg}}.$$

Proof. (i): We first assume that D coincides with the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^n$. It is classical that the stationary discs are the straight lines. By a biholomorphic transformation of $\mathbb{B}^n$ we can displace z_o at 0. It is helpful to use the parametrization

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \mathbb{B}^n \times (0, 1) &\rightarrow M \\ (z, r) &\mapsto (zr, [\bar{z}]), \end{aligned}$$

where brackets denote projectivized coordinates. For fixed $r > 0$, this describes a totally real maximal manifold of $\mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n$; thus $\dim_{CR} M \leq 1$. On the other hand, M is foliated by discs and therefore $\dim_{CR} M = 1$.

Instead, for $r = 0$, we have $TM|_0 = \{0\} \times \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$; thus any point of $M|_0$ is CR singular since there the CR dimension jumps from 1 to $n-1$.

We pass now to a general strictly convex domain D . We know from [8] that there is a mapping $\Psi : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow D$ which interchanges 0 with z_o , is C^ω outside 0, transforms holomorphically the lines of $\mathbb{B}^n$ (denoted $A_{\mathbb{B}^n}$) into the stationary discs of D through z_o (denoted A_D), and which fixes the tangent directions at the “centers”. Therefore, Ψ lifts in a natural way to a mapping between the manifold $M_{\mathbb{B}^n}$ (the union of the $A_{\mathbb{B}^n}^*$ ’s) to the corresponding manifold M_D (the union of A_D^* ’s). Denote by $\mathbb{B}_r^n$ the ball of radius r and put $D_r := \Psi(\mathbb{B}_r^n)$; we know from the theory of Lempert that

$$A_{D_r}^* = (A_D^*)|_{D_r}.$$

Since $(A_{D_r}^*)|_{\partial D_r} \subset \mathbb{P}T_{\partial D_r}^* \mathbb{C}^n$, it follows that $M_D \setminus \pi^{-1}(z_o) \subset \bigcup_r \mathbb{P}T_{\partial D_r}^* \mathbb{C}^n$. Thus, $\mathbb{P}T_{\partial D_r}^* \mathbb{C}^n$ being maximal totally real for any r , we conclude that $M|_{\partial D}$ is a CR manifold except at points of $\pi^{-1}(z_o)$ and that it is CR-diffeomorphic, via Ψ^* , to $M_{\mathbb{B}^n} \setminus \pi^{-1}(0)$.

(ii): The proof is the same as in (i) but uses the boundary version of the Riemann-Lempert mapping Theorem as in Chang-Hu-Lee [4]. □

We are ready for the following, explicit, result.

Theorem 1.4. *Let D be strictly convex with C^ω boundary and let $f \in C^\omega(\partial D)$. Either of the following hypothesis is sufficient for holomorphic extension of f to D .*

(i) *f extends holomorphically along the stationary discs passing through two points of D .*

(ii) *f extends along the discs through a boundary point of ∂D .*

Proof. (i): Let z_o and w_o be the “centers” of the two systems of discs, let A_o be the disc which connects z_o to w_o , and denote by M^{z_o} and M^{w_o} the union of the discs through z_o and w_o respectively. The lift A_o^* is contained in $(M^{z_o})^{\text{reg}}$ apart from a single point over z_o ; but this point is contained in M^{w_o} . Thus we can apply Theorem 1.2.

(ii): If $z_o \in \partial D$, we have directly $A_o^* \subset (M^{z_o})^{\text{reg}}$. □

Remark 1.5. Note that in (ii) the family of discs $\mathcal{V}^{w_o}$ is only used to cover the singular point of M^{z_o} over z_o ; for this purpose, a much more general family than of discs through another point w_o is suitable.

Remark 1.6. Discs by two points of the ball are also present, as a testing family, in the recent preprint [1] by Agranovsky.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Before starting the proof, we have to recall the main results from [8] which will be on use. Stationary discs are stable under reparametrization. In particular, the pole can be displaced at any of their interior points. It is convenient to identify the lift A^* to its image in the projectivized bundle $\mathbb{P}T^* \mathbb{C}^n$ with coordinates $(z, [\zeta])$. We assume that D is strictly convex and that $\partial D \in C^\omega$. In this situation, a stationary disc and its lift A^* are C^ω up to $\partial \Delta$. Moreover, one has the following basic result for whose proof we refer to [8].

Proposition 2.1. *For any point $(z, [\zeta]) \in \mathbb{P}T^* \mathbb{C}^n|_D$ there is unique, up to reparametrization, the stationary disc whose lift $A_{(z, [\zeta])}^*$ contains $(z, [\zeta])$. Moreover, the correspondence*

$$(2.1) \quad (z, [\zeta]) \mapsto A_{(z, [\zeta])}^*, \quad \mathbb{P}T^* \mathbb{C}^n|_D \rightarrow C^\omega(\bar{\Delta}),$$

is a C^ω diffeomorphism.

We begin now the proof of Theorem 1.2 and first remark that at any point of M_j^{reg} , the CR structure is fully provided by the discs $A^* \in \mathcal{V}_j$ by which M_j is foliated. Notice that M_j has a natural “edge” $E_j := \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{V}_j} \partial A^*$. The function f can be naturally lifted to a function F on M_j by gluing the bunch of separate holomorphic extensions $\{f_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{V}_j}$. This is defined by

$$F(z, [\zeta]) = f_{A_{(z, [\zeta])}}(z),$$

where $A_{(z, [\zeta])}$ is the unique stationary disc of $\mathcal{V}_j$ whose lift $A_{(z, [\zeta])}^*$ passes through $(z, [\zeta])$. The crucial point here is that the A ’s may overlap on $\mathbb{C}^n$ but the A^* ’s do not in $\mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n$. The function F is CR on M_j^{reg} . Moreover, since $f \in C^\omega(\partial D)$ and $T_{\partial D}^*\mathbb{C}^n$ is maximally totally real with complexification $\mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n$, then F extends holomorphically to a full neighborhood of $\mathbb{P}T_{\partial D}^*\mathbb{C}^n$ in $\mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n$. By propagation of holomorphic extendibility on M_j^{reg} along the discs $A_{(z, [\zeta])}^*$, F extends holomorphically to a neighborhood of M_j^{reg} . Since $A_o^* \subset \bigcup_j M_j^{\text{reg}}$, then we get the conclusion

$$(2.2) \quad F \text{ is holomorphic in a neighborhood of } A_o^*.$$

We prove now that (2.2) implies

$$(2.3) \quad F \text{ is holomorphic in a neighborhood of any other stationary disc } A_1^* \text{ of } D.$$

To see this, we suppose $A_{(z, [\zeta])}^*(0) = (z, [\zeta])$ and define a function G by means of Cauchy integral

$$G(z, [\zeta]) := (2\pi)^{-1} \int_{\partial \Delta} \frac{f \circ A_{(z, [\zeta])}(\tau)}{\tau} d\tau.$$

This is defined for any $(z, [\zeta]) \in \mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n|_D$, is real analytic, and satisfies

$$G = F \quad \text{in a neighborhood of } A_o^*.$$

Hence F , identified to G , extends holomorphically to the full $\mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n|_D$. Since $\mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n|_D$ is covered by the discs $A_{(z, [\zeta])}^*$ for $(z, [\zeta]) \in \mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n|_D$ (by Proposition 2.1), since $\partial A_{(z, [\zeta])}^* \subset \mathbb{P}T_{\partial D}^*\mathbb{C}^n$ and since F is bounded over these boundaries, then F is in fact bounded on the whole $\mathbb{P}T^*\mathbb{C}^n|_D$. Therefore it is constant with respect to $[\zeta]$. Thus it is a function of z only, the holomorphic extension of f to D .

□

REFERENCES

- [1] **M. Agranovsky**—Holomorphic extension from the unit sphere in $\mathbb{C}^n$ into complex lines passing through a finite set *math. arXiv 0910.3592* (2009)
- [2] **M. Agranovsky and A.M. Semenov**—Boundary analogues of the Hartogs’ theorem, *Siberian Math. J.*, **32** (1991) *Trans. A.M.S.*, **280** (1983), 247–254
- [3] **L. Baracco, A. Tumanov, G. Zampieri**—Extremal discs and holomorphic extension from convex hypersurfaces. *Ark. Mat.* **45** (2007) 1–13
- [4] **C.H. Chang, M.C. Hu and H.P. Lee**—Extremal analytic discs with prescribed boundary data, *Trans. of the A.M.S.*, **310** 1 (1988), 355–369

- [5] **J. Globevnik**—Testing analiticity on rotation invariant families of curves. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **306** (1988), 401–410
- [6] **J. Globevnik**—Analiticity of functions analytic on circles *to appear on Jour. Math. Anal. Appl.* (2009)
- [7] **J. Globevnik, E.L. Stout**—Boundary Morera theorems for holomorphic extendability of CR functions. *Duke Math. J.* **64** (1991), 571–615
- [8] **L. Lempert**—La métrique de Kobayashi et la représentation des domaines sur la boule. (French) [The Kobayashi metric and the representation of domains on the ball *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **109** (1981), 427–474
- [9] **L. Lempert**—A precise result on the boundary regularity of biholomorphic mappings, *Math. Z.* **193** (1986), 559–579
- [10] **W. Rudin** Function theory in the unit ball of $\mathbb{C}^n$. *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften* **241** (1980), Springer, New York-Berlin
- [11] **E.L. Stout**—The boundary values of holomorphic functions of several complex variables, *Duke Math. J.*, **44** 1 (1977), 105–108
- [12] **A. Tumanov**—A Morera type theorem in the strip, *Math. Res. Lett.*, **11** 1 (204), 23–29

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI PADOVA, VIA TRIESTE 63, 35121 PADOVA, ITALY
E-mail address: baracco@math.unipd.it